

Applic. No. 10/667,568

Amdt. dated December 9, 2004

Reply to Office action of September 9, 2004

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-12 and 15-41 remain in the application. Claims 9-12 have been amended. Claims 13 and 14 have been cancelled.

In the first paragraph on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claims 13 and 14 have been objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

The Examiner stated that claims 13 and 14 recite the same thicknesses as claim 1 from which they depend. Claims 13 and 14 have been cancelled. Therefore, the objection by the Examiner is now moot.

In the last two paragraphs on page 2 of the Office action, claims 30, 32-33, 35-36, 38-39, and 41 have been rejected as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

More specifically, the Examiner has stated that the ranges that are set forth in these claim are outside the minimum range set forth in the parent claims. Claims 9-12 have been amended so as to correct the error and to facilitate

Applic. No. 10/667,568

Amdt. dated December 9, 2004

Reply to Office action of September 9, 2004

prosecution of the application. Accordingly, the rejection is believed to have been overcome.

It is accordingly believed that the claims meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs. Should the Examiner find any further objectionable items, counsel would appreciate a telephone call during which the matter may be resolved. The above-noted changes to the claims are provided solely for cosmetic or clarificatory reasons. The changes are not provided for overcoming the prior art nor for any reason related to the statutory requirements for a patent.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 30, 32-33, 35-36, 38-39, and 41 are solicited.

It is appreciatively noted from page 3 of the Office action that claims 1-12, 15-29, 31, 34, 37, and 40 are allowed.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Applic. No. 10/667,568

Amdt. dated December 9, 2004


Reply to Office action of September 9, 2004

Since it is believed that only allowable claims remain, the early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is solicited herewith.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner & Greenberg P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,


For Applicant(s)

AKD:cgm

December 9, 2004

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101